

THE REDS IN DIXIE

**Who Are the Communists
and What Do They Fight
For in the South ?**

By TOM JOHNSON

5c.

SUBSCRIBE

READ

DISTRIBUTE

THE SOUTHERN WORKER

The Paper of the Toiling Masses of the South

•
Official Organ of the Communist Party
of the United States
JIM MALLORY, Editor

•
Subscription Rates:

25 issues (through first-class mail) . . . 50 cents
12 issues 25 cents
Single copies 2 cents
Bundle orders—for 10 or more . . . 1 cent a copy
(Outside the South: 20 issues \$1.00; 5 cents a copy)

•
Send no checks. Send stamps or money orders
payable to Jim Mallory

•
Address

THE SOUTHERN WORKER

Box 572

Birmingham, Ala.

This pamphlet published March, 1935, by
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D, New York City

THE REDS IN DIXIE

Who Are the Communists and What Do They Fight for in the South?

By TOM JOHNSON

FROM Maine to the Gulf and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the country has been rocked this year by the greatest series of strikes and labor disputes in all its history. In every last one of these strikes the issue of Communism was raised. In the textile strike, in the Birmingham coal and ore mine strikes, in the General Strike in San Francisco, and in countless others, the strikers saw the Communists on the picket lines, saw them fighting back the scabs and facing the bayonets of the National Guard. Likewise in the struggles of the unemployed the workers saw the Communists organizing and leading demonstrations for more relief, strikes for higher wages on relief jobs—saw them active in the workers' struggles everywhere.

Yet in spite of this, few people really know who the Communists are and just what they are trying to do. The bosses and the landlords in their newspapers, over the radio and in the movies, tell the workers that the Communists are all foreigners—mostly Jews—who in some way are "against America" and are always stirring up trouble. Here in the South they say we want to tear down the churches, incite race riots, force whites to marry Negroes and eventually turn America over to some foreign country—probably Russia. Even some of the highly paid trade union

leaders like Francis J. Gorman of the United Textile Workers Union, Robert Moore of the Alabama State Federation of Labor, William Mitch of the United Mine Workers and others, repeat these stories and try to stir up the workers against the "Reds". A worker hardly knows what to believe when he sees Communists leading picket lines, working day and night to build powerful unions, and then is told that they are trying to wreck the unions and the country, that they are "un-American".

To put an end to this confusion we propose to tell in this booklet just who the Communists are, what they want and how they expect to get it. We Communists have nothing to conceal; we state our aims openly and honestly. Then every worker must decide for himself whether in his opinion it is good or bad; whether he is with us or against us. We are confident of the result.

WHO ARE THE COMMUNISTS?

First of all, they are working people. The great majority of the members of the Communist Party are men and women who work in textile mills, coal and ore mines, steel mills, on the railroads, in laundries, etc. Of course the Communist Party also takes in sharecroppers, cash renters and even small farm owners, *but it does not take in any bosses, or landlords, or rich farmers who work their land with hired labor.* In other words the Communist Party is an organization of the poor people of this country.

But the bosses say that we are all foreigners; that we are "un-American". How about that? The fact is, as every schoolboy knows, that every single person in America, out-

side of the Indians, either came here from a foreign country or is descended from people who did. Some came later than others, that is all. For instance, the Negroes first reached America 300 years ago, but shall we say they are more "American" than most Southern white workers, whose people came to America 150 years ago, or even later? Of course not! The important thing is that no matter when these people of different nationalities arrived in America, today most of them are working in American shops and mines or are farming American land. Native-born white, native-born Negro, foreign-born white, Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, all work for the same bosses, get the same wage-cuts, stand in the same soup lines when they are unemployed. Some may be worse off than others but all suffer alike under the rule of the bosses. Our Party membership represents every section of the American working class.

Now we can see who the Communists really are: *They are workers, black and white, native and foreign-born, who work in American industries or starve in American soup lines.* Who has a better right to call themselves Americans than those who do America's work?

WHAT DO THE COMMUNISTS WANT?

We said the Communists are *workers*. To understand just what they want let us first of all see what the workers and sharecroppers of the South want and need.

If you are out of a job (and with millions unemployed in the South, the chances are pretty good that you are) *you want most of all enough relief to provide your family*

with sufficient wholesome food, with a home to live in and with clothes to keep them warm. Most workers want their relief in cash so that they can spend it where they want to and on the things they need most. If you have a relief job you want decent wages and union conditions on the job. . . . Now what about the Communists? They are fighting for these very things for every unemployed worker in the country—and, what is more, they are winning them.

It is clear that no unemployed worker can obtain better relief simply by asking for it, with no organization to back him up. Therefore the Communist Party does its best to help the unemployed organize into *Unemployment Councils* which will look out for their interests, just as a trade union protects the interests of its members, and will lead the fight for more relief. In the same way Communists everywhere take the lead in organizing the workers on relief jobs in order to carry on a struggle for better wages and conditions.

Way back in March, 1930, long before the American Federation of Labor, the Socialist Party or any other working class organization had even discussed the question of unemployment, the Communists organized the first big gatherings of the unemployed throughout the country to demand unemployment relief. In New York City alone, over 150,000 workers met in a great mass meeting on March 6, to demand that the city immediately appropriate money for unemployment relief. The meeting was attacked by police and after a hard fight they finally broke it up, *but that same week New York City provided its first*

funds for unemployment relief. In Memphis, in July, 1933, the Communists led 5,000 white and Negro relief workers on strike and in one day won an increase of 25 cents a day for every relief worker in the city. In New Orleans, in the latter part of 1934, a militant demonstration of unemployed forced the city to continue relief payments. These few examples (and we could give hundreds more) show that the Communists not only *say* they are in favor of more relief, but that they also organize the fight for it and *win* it.

WORKERS' UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

But the Communist Party realizes that hand-outs from relief offices alone can never solve the problem. Therefore it has drafted and has presented to Congress the *Workers' Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance Bill (H.R. 2827)*. *This bill provides that every unemployed worker, without exception, shall receive from the government no less than \$10 cash per week and \$3 additional for every dependent in his family, during the whole period in which he is unemployed. The money for these payments is to be provided by the government and the employers through inheritance and income taxes.*

The Workers' Bill also calls for the establishment of old age, sickness, maternity, industrial injury and disability insurance, at the same compensation as that in the case of unemployment.

This bill, the only bill that provides for immediate cash payments to those who are out of work today, has already been introduced in the United States Congress. It has

been endorsed by 2,400 A. F. of L. trade union locals, five international unions, and by thousands of workers' clubs and fraternal orders. All told, over a million workers have agreed to support it. If still more organizations endorse it and enough workers get behind it and demand its passage, Congress will be forced to enact it into law. Then, for the first time, American workers will be assured of a regular cash income, when they can't find jobs.

Under pressure of the growing mass demand for the enactment of the Workers' Bill, H.R. 2827, President Roosevelt presented proposals to Congress for what he calls "economic security". They are embodied in the Wagner-Lewis Bill, at this writing pending before Congress. How do they compare with the Workers' Bill?

FAKE SECURITY

Roosevelt's proposals, as a U. S. Senator put it, are "just a bit of cheese in a trap to catch the mice". It will suffice if we mention here but a few of their chief faults from the standpoint of the workers' needs.

The unemployment insurance section provides not one penny for the many millions who are now unemployed. It sets a limit in the benefit payments at one-half of the worker's weekly wages, but in any case no more than \$15. It will affect only industrial workers and only in those states which will pass legislation to that effect. It allows the states to tax the wages of the employed workers. A worker losing his job is to get no help for four weeks, and after that can get benefit payments for no longer than 15 weeks.

The Communist Party therefore calls upon the workers to fight against Roosevelt's fake "economic security" proposals and for the enactment of the Workers' Unemployment, Old Age and Social Insurance Bill, H.R. 2827.

Can any worker, or honest leader of the workers, find fault with this position of the Communist Party? Can he refuse to join with us in this struggle for more relief and for the passage of the *Workers' Bill*? We don't see how he can do it and justify his action. No, the only ones who will oppose this program are those who want to betray the workers, or those who have been misled by the bosses' fairy tales about the Communists.

ROOSEVELT'S N.R.A. FORCES LOWEST WAGE SCALES IN COUNTRY ON SOUTH

If you are lucky enough to have a job, what do you want? You would be an uncommon sort of worker if you didn't want *higher wages*. The N.R.A. Textile Code calls for a wage of \$12 a week (if you work a full week). In coal mining it is \$3.80 a day. In the saw-mills and other sections of the lumber industry the N.R.A. Code sets a scale of 24 cents an hour. In steel it calls for 25 cents an hour in the Gadsen district and 27 cents in Birmingham. The Birmingham Laundry Code fixed a wage of 14 cents an hour for Negro women—until a strike forced them to agree to a minimum of \$6.56 for a 40-hour week. Can any worker live on wages like these and raise his family in decency, to say nothing of comfort? Let any textile or steel worker, or miner, tell you how much he has in his pay envelope after house rent, store bill and work-

ing supplies are checked off. It's generally nothing but a goose egg.

Besides providing for such starvation wages President Roosevelt's N.R.A. has established the principle that a *Southern worker shall be paid less money for the same work than a Northern worker*. Wages have always been lower and working conditions worse in the South than in any other section of the country (and we will discuss later on why this is so), but now the *United States Government, by means of the so-called Southern "differential", has made lower wages for us Southerners into a law, backed up by the whole power of the government*. For example, the Southern textile worker is supposed to receive a minimum of \$12 a week and the Northern textile worker \$13. The Southern steel worker gets 25 cents an hour and his Northern brother gets a minimum of 40 cents. If you mine coal in Birmingham you get \$3.80 for day work (if your boss lives up to the code). For doing the same job in Pennsylvania you would get \$5.

A. F. OF L. LEADERS VOTED FOR LOWER WAGES IN SOUTH

And the strange part of it is that several trade union leaders (but not Communists!), including President McMahon of the United Textile Workers and John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers, *helped write these codes and voted for the N.R.A. wage differentials, which give Southern workers the lowest wages in the country*. Of course, these gentlemen don't have to live on these wages themselves. McMahon collects a princely salary from the money the textile workers pay into the union in

dues, and Lewis gets \$12,000—just about 15 times more than a member of his union gets in the South.

Then there is the speed-up and stretch-out. A weaver for the Piedmont Mfg. Co. testified at a federal hearing in South Carolina that he worked 118 looms, and that no weaver for the company had less than 94. *The American Wool and Cotton Reporter*, not satisfied with this, said, on October 25, 1934, that the objective in the industry should be 150 looms per weaver.

Working under such conditions a man is worn out, ready for the scrap heap before he is forty. Moreover, when one man does the work of two it means cutting someone out of a job, and so the speed-up helps swell the ranks of the unemployed.

How have the bosses made out under the N.R.A.? According to the figures of the United States Government the profits of the big corporations increased 60 per cent during the year of the N.R.A. That looks as if these companies could afford to pay us decent wages—but did they do it? On the contrary, during the same period the real wages of American workers, that is, their ability to purchase goods that they need, *went down 1 per cent*. This was admitted by Richberg in his report to Roosevelt, which said that average wages increased 8.5 per cent from June, 1933, to June, 1934, while the cost of living increased 9.6 per cent during that period. It begins to look as if the Communists were right when they said, over a year and a half ago, that the N.R.A. and Roosevelt's whole program, in spite of all its fine promises to the workers, aimed to help

only the biggest bosses, and not the working class and poor farmers.

COMMUNISTS FIGHT FOR HIGHER WAGES

Instead of blindly accepting the N.R.A. program as the leaders of the American Federation of Labor propose, which in most cases has lowered wages rather than raised them and has forced the lowest wage scales in the country on the Southern workers, the Communist Party calls on the workers and their organizations to fight for the following demands:

1. *General wage increases in all industries to keep up with the rising cost of living.*

2. *An end to the infamous N.R.A. Southern "differential" and equal pay for the same work for white and Negro, North and South.*

3. *No more stretch-out and speed-up in the mills and mines. The speed of work to be regulated by the trade unions.*

4. *The 30-hour, five-day week with no reduction in wages, as a means of sending at least a part of the unemployed back to work.*

We all know that the bosses will never grant these demands willingly. They will only be granted when the workers, by their organized power and fighting ability, force the bosses to grant them. Therefore the Communist Party strives with all its strength to build a powerful trade union movement in the South and throughout the country.

But what kind of a trade union movement shall we build? We want to see unions built which will serve the

workers and not betray them; unions led by men who can win strikes and not simply lead them to defeat. *Unfortunately for the workers, most of the unions in the South today are led by men who either do not know how to win strikes which will improve the conditions of the workers, or else do not want to win them.* This is a serious charge, but by an examination of a couple of recent strikes (all we have space to deal with) we shall prove that every word of it is true.

HOW THE A. F. OF L. LEADERS LOST THE ALABAMA MINE STRIKES

Alabama workers will remember the bitterly fought coal and ore mine strikes in Birmingham last spring (1934). In April both the coal and ore miners were preparing to strike for higher wages and the recognition of their unions. At the same time the steel workers were talking strike and their union had even set a date for a national strike (June 15), if their demands were not granted. Now, almost all of these workers, coal and ore miners and steel workers, are employed by the same big steel companies. In other words they were all preparing to fight the same bosses. In order to win the demands of all these workers in the shortest possible time and with the least hardship to them, the sensible thing to do was to send them *all into one solid strike at the same time.* The Communist Party proposed this policy long before the strike and the workers agreed with it. But the officials at the head of these unions, Bill Mitch of the United Mine Workers (coal miners' union), Lipscomb and Cole of the

Mill, Mine and Smelter Workers (the union of the ore miners), Crawford of the steel workers' union, had different ideas. *They refused* to call the men all out at one time.

The result was that the coal miners struck in April by themselves, and after two strikers had been murdered they were sent back to the mines defeated, *without a single demand won*.

Just one week after the coal miners returned to work Cole and Lipscomb called out the ore miners—also alone. The same thing happened. They struck alone and they lost alone, after six more strikers had been murdered by sheriffs and the National Guard. The leaders of the steel workers refused to allow their men to strike at all, and as a result the union in the mills is falling apart and the boss-controlled company unions are growing by leaps and bounds.

Both of these strikes could have been won, if the coal and ore miners had both gone out together, with the support of the steel workers. And, remember, the *workers wanted to strike together*. It was their leaders who prevented it and who are responsible for the loss of both strikes.

It does not matter whether Mitch and Lipscomb and Cole and the rest of the high union officials simply made mistakes in these strikes due to their own stupidity, or whether they actually sold them out to the steel companies, the result was the same. Officials like these have no right to call themselves "labor leaders". They should be run out of

their well-paid positions and sent back to the mines to sweat for their \$3.80 a day.

HOW GORMAN "LED" THE TEXTILE STRIKE

Now let us take a look at the great textile strike. Before the strike the Communist textile workers proposed to the other members of the United Textile Workers Union and to the union officials, that the strike be conducted along the following lines:

1. That the whole industry be called on strike the first day.
2. That mass picket lines be established and kept up before every mill.
3. That a national campaign be started at once to raise relief for the strikers.
4. That there be no arbitration of demands and no settlement of the strike until the strikers had voted on and approved the terms of the settlement.

The Communists warned the strikers that the high officials of the union might try to betray the strike and it advised them to take charge of things themselves, by electing at each mill committees from their own ranks to lead the struggle. Furthermore, the Communist Party warned the strikers not to believe the tall talk of Gorman (the National Secretary of the U.T.W. who was in charge of the strike), who said that President Roosevelt was behind the strike and that Roosevelt would see to it that the strikers received federal relief, that the National Guard would not be called out, etc. The Communists warned especially against any fake

strike settlement which Gorman might try to put over at the request of Roosevelt.

Gorman and McMahon and the rest of the U.T.W. officials decided on another policy. First of all they refused to call the whole industry out at once. They called out the cotton mills the first day, a few days later the woolen mills and part of the hosiery mills, and a week or so later the silk mills. The rayon mills were never called out. This weakened the strike from the start. Then they tried to stop the mass picketing and the flying squadrons which the workers had organized themselves, in many cases over the opposition of the officials, and which had proved the best means of getting the workers out of the mills.

ROOSEVELT BETRAYS THE TEXTILE STRIKERS

Of course, as the Communists had foretold, all the talk about Roosevelt backing up the strike, supplying federal relief and refusing to allow the National Guard to be used, was just so much hot air. The National Guard was called out in seven States—in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Rhode Island, Maine and Connecticut—and before they got through, *Roosevelt's Guardsmen had murdered 16 strikers*. Further, at the request of the Governor of Rhode Island, President Roosevelt announced in the papers that he was preparing to send the United States Army into Rhode Island to break the strike. However, before the Army could get there, the Rhode Island National Guard succeeded in murdering two more strikers and in pretty well breaking the strike, so the

regular Army was not needed. *This is the way Gorman's friend, President Roosevelt, backed up the textile strikers.* But Gorman, with Roosevelt's help, had not yet finished his job of breaking the strike.

LEADERS SELL OUT TEXTILE STRIKE

Suddenly, when the strike was at its very height and still spreading, the U.T.W. officials called off the strike without consulting the strikers and without a single demand granted. The workers were ordered back to the mills under the same conditions against which they struck.

How did the U.T.W. officials attempt to justify this action? They said President Roosevelt had asked them to end the strike and that he had guaranteed that all the strikers would be taken back without discrimination, and that their demands would be "investigated" by a committee which he would name. You would think that after the way Roosevelt had already acted in the textile strike, and the way the "impartial boards" he appointed months ago to investigate conditions in the steel and auto industries had refused the workers wage increases and union recognition, any trade union leader would have had just about a belly-full of Roosevelt's "promises". You would think that by this time these leaders would realize that these so-called "impartial" boards are *always* controlled by the bosses and *never* decide anything important in favor of the unions. But not the U.T.W. officials! They jumped at this offer with both hands and ordered the strikers back to work.

The workers were stunned. They wanted to continue

the struggle, but Gorman's announcement had broken the backbone of the strike, so they tried to get back to their jobs—and promptly found that over 40,000, including the best union fighters and local leaders, were locked out or permanently blacklisted. So much for the promises of that "great friend of Organized Labor", President Roosevelt.

Sixteen strikers murdered, 40,000 blacklisted, not one demand granted, and still the U.T.W. officials have the gall to call this a "victory". *We call it the most shameful betrayal in the history of the trade union movement and a majority of the textile workers are fast coming to call it the same thing.*

WHO IS "WRECKING THE UNIONS"?

These are the policies and these are the leaders who are wrecking the trade unions and bringing lower wages and worse conditions to millions of American working men and women. All their shouting about the "Reds" destroying the unions will not change these facts. And this is not at all surprising. When men draw salaries of from \$5,000 to \$20,000 a year as most of these "leaders" do, they begin to *think like bosses and act like bosses*—and to forget the interests of the workers whom they are supposed to represent.

The Communist Party is unalterably opposed to such policies and such "leadership". We propose that the rank-and-file members, the men and women who pay the dues and form the union membership, take charge of their own organizations and run them along lines which will

insure the winning of strikes and not their invariable defeat. In order to do this job, we propose that the union members who agree that it is necessary, *organize a struggle inside their own local union and on a national scale for the following program:*

1. Democracy in the unions. Every official to be elected by the membership and not appointed by other officials. (As Bill Mitch, who was run out of Indiana by the miners, was appointed President of District 20 by John L. Lewis, the International President of the U.M.W.A., without the members in the District having a word to say in the matter.) Every official subject to recall from his position at any time by a majority vote of the membership.

2. A general policy of struggle (by strike actions, etc.), for the needs of the workers, and not a policy of the union "cooperating" with the bosses and the strike-breaking N.R.A. No arbitration of disputes. (Remember the "arbitration" of the textile strike!)

3. Immediate preparations for strike action, if necessary, in all industries, for higher wages. A well organized campaign to bring into the unions the unorganized workers.

4. No more trust in, or cooperation with, the strike-breaking N.R.A. Labor Boards, Mediation Boards, etc. Immediate resignation of all union officials from such boards as they are now serving on.

5. No more 10- and 20-thousand-dollar-a-year "labor leaders". Union officials to receive the same wages as the members of union.

6. Equal right in the unions for Negroes, women and

young workers. No discrimination against Negroes in the union or on the job.

7. No discrimination against union members because of their religious or political beliefs.

To put this program into effect the Communists in the trade unions are aiding in the organization of *rank-and-file committees* in every local union. These committees represent the interests of the rank-and-file membership, and are leading the struggle within the unions for the Rank-and-File Program outlined above. Only when we have convinced a majority of the union members of the correctness of this program and of the necessity of fighting for it, will the membership be able to remove the officials who have betrayed them and transform the unions into the fighting weapons of the working class, which they can and should be.

This, in brief, is the Communist Party program in the trade unions. Is it a program for "wrecking the unions", as the highly paid officials, from William Green of the A. F. of L. on down, would have you believe? *On the contrary, it is the only program which will save the unions and rebuild them into powerful organizations which can and will win higher wages and better conditions for millions of workers.* The only thing this program will wreck is the opportunity of incompetents (to use no stronger word) like Francis J. Gorman, Bill Mitch, etc., to draw down their fat salaries every month—and that is just why these gentlemen fight it and lie about the Communists.

WHAT DO THE SHARECROPPERS NEED?

Now, let us say that you are a sharecropper, or a cash renter, or even a farmer who owns a bit of land he works himself, what do you need most of all today? The first thing the poverty-stricken croppers and small farmers in the South need is *enough to eat*. Nowhere in the whole country is there as much hunger, suffering and actual starvation as on Southern farms. Second, the cropper and cash renter want the absolute right to gin and sell their share of the crop themselves without interference from the landlord. They want, if they are to live they must have, lower rent. They want the checks mailed farmers by the government, for land left out of cultivation, sent direct to them and not to the landlord. And they don't want the landlord's, or the storekeeper's, or the banker's name on the check either. That check must be theirs to do with as they see fit.

They want the repeal of the insane Bankhead Bill, which forces farmers to restrict the planting of food and other staple crops, while the farmers themselves and millions of others go hungry. They want a stop put to the foreclosure of mortgages on small farms, to the eviction of any cropper, renter or poor owner from the land he works, and an end to the practice of seizing tools and stock for debts. They want the wiping out (cancellation) of all debts and obligations which the cropper and poor owner cannot pay back because the prices he receives for cotton, corn and tobacco are so low. They want full school terms for their children, free school books and free buses to

carry the children to and from school. And finally the Negro croppers want freedom from the chains of semi-slavery which bind them to the landlord.

The farm workers, the cotton pickers, choppers, etc., want higher wages, an eight-hour day and the right to organize and strike.

THE COMMUNISTS FIGHT FOR THESE DEMANDS

Isn't this just about what the croppers and poor farmers of the South want and need? Well, these points were copied almost word for word from the program of the Communist Party in the South. *The Communist Party is leading the fight for every last one of these demands.* Moreover, the Communist Party saw to it that in the 73rd and 74th sessions of Congress bills were introduced containing these demands and providing in addition for the appropriation by the government of two billion dollars for immediate cash relief for the starving croppers and poor farmers.

As a vital part of this struggle for the needs of the croppers, the Communists in the South have aided greatly in the organization of the *Sharecroppers Union*, which today has over 8,000 members in the heart of the Black Belt. *This year, through its militant struggle, the Sharecroppers Union has won the right to gin and sell their own cotton for large numbers of croppers and renters.* It has forced the county relief stations to give groceries and clothes to hundreds of farm families. As this is written, it is in the think of a fight in Lee and Tallapoosa Counties in Alabama, to force the planters to pay a minimum of \$1

a hundred and \$15 a month food allowance to the cotton pickers. Already these demands have been won on some plantations. All over the country the Communist Party is helping to organize the renters and poverty-stricken owners for similar struggles.

Can any cropper or small owner afford to reject this program and say he is opposed to it? Will it hurt the farmers of the South or will it help them? Of course it will help every poor farmer in the South—and that is why the Communist Party fights for such a program.

WHY WAGES ARE LOWER AND CONDITIONS WORSE IN THE SOUTH

The truly terrible position of the Southern cropper—always underfed, ragged and often barefoot even in winter, denied the right to sell his own crop, chained by debt to a landlord who usually treats him little better than a slave—is typical of the conditions of life and work of the whole working population of the South. Here wages are lower, hours longer and relief scarcer and harder to get than in any other section of the country.

Nor is it just confined to wages and hours. The whole level of life is lower and more backward south of the Mason and Dixon line. School terms are shorter and there are fewer schools (particularly for Negroes). Nowhere in the country are there so many grown men and women who have never had a chance to learn to read and write. Methods of torture such as the chain gang, the dog house and the lash, long ago outlawed in most countries, are still in common use in our jails and prisons.

And it is no accident that Memphis and Birmingham have more murders and shootings in proportion to their population than any other city in the world. Here, too, pellagra, the bloody flux and a half dozen other starvation diseases flourish as they do nowhere else.

And here the oppression of the working people by the bosses and great landlords know no limit. Half the population is denied even the fundamental right to vote by means of Jim Crow regulations and the poll tax. Traditional American liberties, supposedly guaranteed by the Constitution, such as the right to gather in mass meetings to protest grievances, the right to publish working class newspapers, etc., are trampled underfoot. Union organizers are murdered and strikers shot down with machine guns, while protest against this bloody rule is followed by K.K.K. raids and often a lynching.

How does all this happen? Why is the South more backward than the North? Why is it that Southern workers must suffer more than those in the North or the West? It isn't hard to figure out. There are two main causes:

First, the fact that before the Civil War the slave system prevented the South from developing industry and kept it poorer than the North, where big shops and factories were springing up all over the land. The real industrial development in the South began only since the World War and especially during the post-war period. This development came about as a result of heavy investments by Northern capitalists. That is why so many mines, mills and factories that have opened in the South, like those of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Corporation, are owned by

Northern bankers and bosses. That is why since that time the South has been more or less under the control of the greatest bankers and bosses in this country with headquarters in Wall Street. Even those Southern bosses who do own mills and mines are tied up with the Wall Street finance magnates who dominate the Southern industries.

The Northern capitalists saw fit to invade the South because they faced more and more resistance in the North on the part of the workers who were organizing into unions and striking for better conditions. The Northern bosses and bankers saw a fertile field in the South, where they could take advantage of the fact that the workers had a lower standard of living and knew almost nothing of trade unions. And they hoped to perpetuate this condition, and low wages, by taking advantage of the division among the workers due to circumstances shown below.

The second reason why wages are lower and conditions worse in the South, is the fact that slavery in the South has never been completely abolished. It is true that a Negro worker cannot be bought and sold like an animal any more (although there are cases where this has been done lately in the Black Belt), but no one who thinks the question over would say that the Negroes are *free* today. Negroes are a part of the working class, in some industries they are in the majority, and yet they can't vote, and are liable to be lynched if they try to organize. In the Black Belt the Negro croppers are in even worse shape—with few more rights than a slave had in the old days. *Now, how can the working class put up a real fight against wage cuts, long hours and starvation, as long as almost one-half*

the workers are not really FREE but are practically slaves? It is clear that the white workers cannot do much to improve things as long as the Negroes are in chains.

Just as important is the fact that the old traditions of slavery are used—and used successfully—to divide the white and Negro workers. We have seen in the Alabama coal and ore strikes and in the textile strike what happens when the ranks of the workers are divided and they fail to act together. This very division between black and white in the South is largely responsible for forcing lower wages and worse conditions on every Southern worker—be he white or black. Let us see just how it works.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN WHITE AND NEGRO ARE DIVIDED

Any worker who has been through a strike in the South knows something about it. Let us take a foundry, for example, where 50 white and 50 Negro moulders are employed. Let us say that all the whites belong to the Moulders Union and that their local refuses to admit Negroes to membership (and many Southern Locals of the Moulders Union do bar Negroes) on the usual ground that colored moulders are just "niggers" and should not be allowed to join an organization of the "superior" whites. Moreover, let us suppose that the white moulders and their Union are continually trying to get the boss to fire the Negroes and hire whites in their place (and this is going on in almost every foundry in the South that employs both white and colored moulders). And last, let us say that the Negro moulders are getting less pay for the same work

than the whites (and this is the usual thing in the South.)

Then there is a wage cut and the whites are cut to the same pay as the Negroes. They decide to strike. They ask the Negroes to come out with them, for they realize that unless the Negro moulders also strike, they cannot hope to win. As soon as the boss gets wind of the strike plans he rushes to the Negroes and tells them the old story, "Why should you strike together with that white trash? They refused to accept you in their union, they abused you in the shop and then even tried to get me to fire all of you and hire white men in your place. If you boys go out and help them win they'll start the same thing all over again when they get back in the shop. Better stick with me and get some of your colored friends to come in and break the strike of this white trash. I'll see that you colored boys get a square deal".

Now those Negro moulders may strike or they may fall for the fine promises of the boss and refuse to go out—and considering the treatment they have received from the white workers, who could blame them if they refused to strike? And if they don't strike the chances are 100 to 1 that the white moulders will lose their strike. Whose fault will it be if they do lose through lack of support from the Negroes? Their own, of course!

If the Negro moulders go on strike, the boss merely works the same trick in reverse. He brings in white moulders as strike-breakers and he sings them a different tune: "Those strikers are just a bunch of dirty 'niggers' anyway. It isn't like scabbing on white men. And besides, if you'll help me break the strike I will agree to do what

you have always wanted—kick all the 'niggers' out and hire only white moulders. Come on in and take the jobs; we whites have got to stick together against those black apes." And so the strike is broken.

This is the way the boss-inspired idea of "white superiority" always works out in practice. Wherever it is accepted it results in broken strikes, smashed unions and the lowest wage scales in the country. It has done far more than any other one thing to keep wages at starvation levels throughout the South.

THE QUESTION OF SOCIAL EQUALITY

Many white workers will agree so far, and say, "Yes, it is true that white and colored have to stick together in strikes and on the job, if they want to win anything. I am in favor of that. And it may even be necessary to give the Negro the vote in order that we working people can elect some of our own kind to office—men who will stick with us and not the bosses. But when it comes to letting down the Jim Crow bars altogether and giving the colored man social equality, I say nothing doing."

This white worker forgets just one thing: That if you want a man to fight your battles shoulder to shoulder with you, you have to treat him like a human being and a brother long before the fight starts and all along the line. It's a pretty poor sort of man who will treat another like a hound dog all his life and then when he needs his help come running to that same man for assistance. That is exactly what white workers do when they treat Negroes like inferior people, often barring them from their unions

or discriminating against them within the union, and then ask these same Negroes to come out with them in case of a strike. It must be said, to the everlasting credit of the Negroes, that in spite of such shabby treatment, they are usually the first to strike and the best fighters once they have struck.

IS IT TRUE THAT WHITES ARE "SUPERIOR" TO NEGROES?

We have seen how the bosses work the old "white superiority" trick to break strikes and lower wages. Now what about the idea itself; is there any truth in it? The answer is, *none whatever*. In the World War American Negro troops proved themselves to be among the best fighting men in the whole world. In the fields of science, literature, music and art—in fact, wherever a good brain counts—Negro men and women have shown themselves to be the equal of any race, once they have an equal opportunity. The findings of the greatest scientists and students of racial characteristics all prove that under similar conditions the Negro is in no sense the inferior of the white man. Finally, any white worker who went through the recent mine, textile or longshoremen's strikes (to mention only a few) knows that no more loyal and courageous union man exists than the Southern Negro.

WILL "WHITE SUPERIORITY" BRING BETTER CONDITIONS TO THE WHITE WORKER?

This fairy tale of "white superiority" is false from top to bottom—a lie carefully cultivated and drilled into the minds of the white workers for just one purpose—to split the ranks of the working class and weaken the fighting

power of the workers. *Does it fill the stomach of the white worker when he is starving to believe that he is superior to the Negro? Does it get him higher wages and better conditions? Of course not! It serves the interest of but one class and one alone—the bosses, the capitalist class.*

Just as the Communist Party fights any other anti-working class policy of the bosses, so too it fights the idea of "white superiority". And it fights it in the only practical way it can be fought: *by organizing and leading the daily struggles of the Negro people for full equality in every field of life, and above all by drawing the white workers into the forefront of these battles.*

By means of demonstrations and joint protests of white and Negro workers the Communist Party leads the struggle to end discrimination against Negroes in the distribution of relief and jobs, and on the job. It gives expression to its demand for equal political rights by running Negro candidates for office in the heart of the South, as it did in the last elections, and by organizing a national campaign for the right of Negroes to vote in the South. In the Scottsboro case of legal lynching the Communists have roused the whole world of Labor to protest against the death verdict passed on these innocent Negro boys by a Southern boss-controlled court, and have saved the boys from the electric chair for three long years.

Only the Communist Party has called for the organization of defense groups of white and Negro workers to protect the Negro people from the lynch mobs of the bosses and landlords by all possible means, and demands the *death penalty for all lynchers.* Only the Communist Party

openly defies the Jim Crow laws and regulations of the Southern ruling class and smashes these bars between black and white wherever possible.

Does all this mean that the Communist Party demands that white men must marry Negro girls or that Negro men must marry or sleep with white women? Of course not! This is simply another lie of the bosses—and a pretty stupid one at that. The Communist Party does not attempt to order the personal lives of its members or any worker. Whom a worker shall marry is up to the man and woman involved and no one else.

On the other hand every Southerner knows that nothing is more common than for white men to sleep with Negro women—frequently in spite of the violent objection of the woman. Nor is it unknown for white women to sleep with Negro men. It's done under cover, that's all. These are facts which no one can deny. The Communist Party proposes to put an end to this damnable sneaking, around-the-corner and in-the-back-door stuff. *While forcing no white person to marry a Negro and no Negro to marry a white person it demands the absolute right of white to marry Negro and Negro to marry white where both parties desire this.* In other words it demands and fights for complete and unrestricted social equality for the Negro people in every field of human relations.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE BLACK BELT

A large part of the Negro people live in what is commonly known as the Black Belt. This territory, including over 200 counties, stretches thousands of square miles in

a continuous line, although crossing into several states. In this territory the Negro people are a majority of the population, especially of the laboring population. Here it is the Negroes who do the work, raise the cotton and corn and work in the turpentine and lumber camps. The whites, outside of a comparatively small number of croppers and renters, are mostly landlords and bosses of one kind or another.

Practically since the beginning of its settlement the Negroes outnumbered the white by far. It is with their toil, with their sweat and blood, that the cotton plantations and all the other wealth of the Black Belt were developed. For generations this has been and it still is the homeland of the Negro people. And yet, right in this territory, where they are a majority of the population and produce all the wealth, the Negroes are even more oppressed and exploited than elsewhere.

Here, in the homeland of the Negro people, the Negroes, although supposed to be free men under the law, have no rights at all and are hardly better off than slaves. They are bound to their plantations by a heavy burden of debts to the landlords. Should a Negro attempt to escape this slavery and leave the plantation, he runs the risk of being arrested and sent to the chain gang.

In this territory the Negro can be beaten, shot, lynched by the first white landlord who may or may not have some grudge against him. And the Negro can have no protection from the landlord-made and landlord-enforced law. Here the land which they have tilled for generations is owned by the white landlords. The government, and all its

agencies, is in the hands of the worst enemies of the Negroes, a handful of white bosses and landlords. In this homeland of the Negro people, they are in the same condition, if not worse, as are the native peoples in the colonies who are held in subjection by armed force by foreign rulers. As, for instance, the native peoples in India under British rule.

THE QUESTION OF NEGRO RULE IN THE BLACK BELT

The Communist Party believes that the Negro people in the Black Belt, if they are to be really free, should have the right to control and govern this territory and to develop their life and their culture in their own way. It believes that the Negro people in the Black Belt should be secure from interference either by the white bosses and landlords in this territory or by the Wall Street gang and the Federal Government which they control.

This does not mean that we want to establish some sort of Jim Crow State. On the contrary, the white croppers and workers in the Black Belt would be welcome to stay. They would have equal rights, would have a voice in the government, and their rights would be fully protected. It simply means that the Negro people, *as the majority* in this territory, would have the right to self-government, the right to determine what kind of government it is to have, and what connection, if any, this nation is to have with the U.S. Government.

The Negro people may not want to set up a separate nation from the U.S., and the Communist Party would never think of forcing it on them. Moreover, if the Negro

people in the Black Belt should get the opportunity of self-government at a time when the working class would be in power in the U.S., the Negro Communists would undoubtedly advocate that this nation should remain a federated part of the Soviet U.S. But the Communist Party will support and fight for, and calls upon the white workers to fight for, the right of the Negro people in the Black Belt to full self-government, their right even to establish a separate nation, if they should wish to do so. This is what we mean by the demand for the *right of the Negro people in the Black Belt to self-determination*.

HOW THE BOSSES USE RELIGION TO DIVIDE THE WORKERS

There is one other issue which, although it is not so dangerous for the workers as the issue of white superiority, is frequently used by the bosses to divide the workers. That is the question of *religion*. The Ku Klux Klan, for example, does its best not only to stir up white against Negro, but also Protestant against Catholic. This is just one more fake issue which the bosses use to divide the workers and prevent them from united struggle against wage cuts. It ought to be clear to Protestant workers by now that the main enemy is not the Pope in Rome, but the boss, right here at home. The Pope may not be much good, he may even be harmful (and frankly, we Communists think he is), *but it is against the boss right here in America, who cuts the wages of both Methodist and Catholic, that we must direct the main fight*. And the only way to do it successfully is for Catholic and Methodist to forget their religious differences and unite to fight their common enemy—the capitalist class.

As usual, the bosses try to use the religious question also against the Communists. They say the "Reds" want to tear down all the churches and force everyone to stop worshipping God. Just another lie, of course. The Communist Party, as a Party, is not a religious organization, nor does it subscribe to a belief in any God. It believes we workers have to make a better world right here and not wait for it until we get to any heaven. At the same time the Communist Party points out that the preachers (especially the best paid ones) and the churches are often used by the bosses to discourage union organization and to break strikes. Every miner in Birmingham knows how the steel and coal companies got many local preachers to try their best to convince the workers not to strike. Every Negro knows that many of the biggest preachers fought the defense of the Scottsboro boys from start to finish. But the Communist Party does not and will not tear down the churches where workers wish to worship, nor does it force anyone to renounce their religion. *The Communist Party welcomes into its ranks workers of any and every creed, so long as they agree with our program and honestly wish to fight for a better life for all workers.* All such lies about the Communists are simply attempts of the bosses to split the ranks of the workers. Intelligent workers will treat them with the contempt they deserve.

WHAT ABOUT THE QUESTION OF "REVOLUTION"?

Finally, the bosses try to frighten the workers away from the Communists by shouting that the Communists want a "revolution", that they are "against the government", etc.

They talk as if the Communists had invented the idea of revolution and had some kind of a patent on it, when every child knows that the United States was born and became a separate country, as the result of a revolution—and a mighty bloody one at that. Of course that revolution, while it was a step forward in the development of the country, was a revolution of one set of bosses (American bosses) against another set (the British bosses). Although it was the workers and farmers who fought and bled and died in 1776 to free this country from the British, it is the bosses who have reaped its benefits and have taken over the country we won for them for themselves.

When the bosses find they can't scare the workers away from the Communists by shouting that we want a revolution, they add the word "violent" to it, and try to convince the workers that we believe in bombing, murder, rape and what have you. What are the facts? In the first place it is the bosses and their police and National Guards that are guilty of violence. Who murdered 16 workers in the textile strike? *Not the Communists or the non-Communist workers but the police and sheriffs.* Who bombed the house of John Davis, the Communist candidate for Governor of Alabama in the last elections? *Surely not the Communists, but certainly some labor-hating outfit like the White Legion.* Who is responsible for the lynching of 64 Negroes since January, 1933? *Certainly not the Communists, who lead the fight against lynching, but exactly the bosses and big landlords of the South.* Who is it that tries to stir up trouble, incite riots and murder workers in every strike? *Again we say, not the Communists but the*

bitterest enemies of Communism—the bosses and their thugs and police.

The Communist Party always has and always will condemn and fight against the use of bombs, murder and individual terror in the labor movement or outside of it. We know that such methods can't win—they can only hurt the cause of the workers. But the Communist Party will never advise the Negro people to submit meekly while they are cheated, beaten and lynched by the landlords. Nor will it ever advise workers to make no defense when they are attacked and murdered by the White Legion thugs or the police and National Guard. *On the contrary, the Communist Party strives to organize the workers to protect themselves from the violence of the bosses and their thugs by all possible means.* The same thing will be true of the revolution when it comes. If a majority of the poor people of the country have decided that a revolution is necessary and start to carry it out, and a handful of bosses, backed up by their police and army, try to prevent it and attack the workers, then we workers will defend ourselves and our revolutionary program from their violence with arms in hand—just as our forefathers did in 1776. Now for the facts concerning this question of revolution.

We are living in a country where a very small group of men (the biggest bosses, bankers, etc., that is, the *capitalist class*) either own or control all the shops and mills and mines and most of the best land. In other words this small group just about owns the country and runs it to suit themselves. None of these people do much work themselves (if any) and yet they have by far the biggest

share of the nation's income. On the other hand, the great majority of the population are working people of one kind or another. In order to live we have to get a job from one of the bosses and go to work in his factory or mine or on his land. We do the work and at most we get just a bare living out of it.

THE CAPITALIST CLASS MAKES A MESS OF THINGS

This is bad enough at any time, *but it is much worse if it turns out that the capitalist class which owns and runs the industries and the country, is unable to run it efficiently enough to even give work to the rest of us who must work in order to live.* That is what has happened now. The factories for producing clothes, shoes, autos, everything one needs, are standing idle. The workers who were employed in them are tramping the streets looking for jobs they can't find. And meanwhile we all suffer from the lack of the same clothes, shoes and so on, that those idle factories should be producing.

Things are even worse on the farms. The government had us plow up every third row of cotton one year, and now they are paying farmers to plant *less cotton*. Meanwhile, the very farmer who is paid not to raise cotton, hasn't got a whole pair of cotton jeans on his legs or a whole shirt on his back. In the Middle West the government is buying up hogs, butchering them and throwing the carcasses in the rivers. Wheat farmers are paid not to produce wheat, while at the same time half the country goes without meat and has no wheat for bread. It all sounds kind of insane, doesn't it?

Well, it *is* insane, but the capitalist class can't very well help it, as we shall show. Take your own boss, for example. If you are a textile worker, your boss established the mill where you work (or more likely, used to work), and runs it for just one reason—to *make money*. And it stands to reason that the less he has to pay you in wages the more money he will make. Therefore every boss—that is, capitalist—is interested in cutting wages just as low as possible. And why does your boss use the stretch-out and force you to do more work? Also because it means more money, higher profits, for him. Of course this stretch-out, and the continual installation of machinery to do the work of men, mean that fewer and fewer men are needed to run the mill. As a result, when you go to work one fine morning you find that you "are no longer needed"—you're laid off.

When you were working, even at low wages, you were able to buy things for yourself and your family. If you are a skilled worker you probably bought not only food and clothes but also a radio or a washing machine for the wife, maybe even a cheap car. Then, when your wages were cut, you could buy less and less of these things; it was all you could do to buy food and clothing and pay the rent. Now you have lost your job and as a result you can buy nothing.

WHAT CAUSES UNEMPLOYMENT?

This is mighty tough on you, and although he probably doesn't realize it, it is going to do your boss some harm also. In the first place you have to realize that there are

may have bought your mill with the money his father left him, or that he stole, or that he made out of other workers like yourself. *And yet, simply because he can no longer make money with this mill which the workers built, he shuts it down and throws the men and women who depend on it for a living out on the street to starve.*

We Communists do not think that your boss, or any other capitalist, should be allowed to close down your mill and doom thousands of workers to continual hunger and perhaps starvation, merely because he is not making money. In fact, we don't think the capitalists should exercise any control whatsoever over the mills and shops of this country. *In the first place these things belong to the working class by the best possible of all rights—because the workers built them with their sweat and labor. In the second place, the capitalists have shown themselves incapable of running the industries of the country in a manner which will give every worker a job and every poor farmer land of his own, and will give all those who work enough food, shelter, clothing and the other necessities of life. The capitalist class has made such a mess of the whole business that it is fast becoming absolutely necessary for the workers to take over the mills and mines and run them themselves if the whole country is not to run into a complete smash up.*

THE WORKERS CAN PREVENT UNEMPLOYMENT AND STARVATION

And the workers can do the job! If the working class, led by the Communist Party, was in power tomorrow, we would open the warehouses where the food and clothing

the capitalists cannot sell at a profit, and therefore will not sell at all, is stored. We would distribute these goods to the unemployed who are hungry and in rags today. Then we would open the closed factories, which the capitalists will not open because they cannot run them at a profit. The millions of the unemployed would go back to their jobs and together we would produce an abundance of everything the people need. We could do it because we workers are not interested in profits—we are interested only in producing the goods the people need.

RUSSIAN WORKERS SHOW THE WAY

Don't think all this is an idle dream. Way back in 1917 the Russian workers succeeded in throwing their bosses off their backs and in taking over their country for the workers and poor farmers. As a result in the Soviet* Union (Russia) there is no crisis or depression today and no unemployment. Wages have increased steadily every year—last year by 10 per cent. In December, 1934, another increase of 10 per cent was announced, which took effect in January, 1935, while the seven-hour day has been established by law. There is no blacklisting and jailing of union men and women in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Soviet workers are organized 100 per cent and the trade unions take a leading part in directing the affairs of the country. There workers and toiling farmers, people like

* Soviet means "Council". In Russia these Soviets, or Councils, are the governing bodies which rule the country (as the Congress and President rule this country). The members of the Soviets are elected by the workers and farmers, whom they represent.

yourself, are in control of the whole country. The oppression of the scores of minority nationalities which prevailed under the tsarist government has been absolutely stopped under the workers' rule. Every nationality or racial group within the Soviet Union is given the fullest opportunity to develop its own life in its own way, up to and including the right of self-determination for every large national group within its borders. Negro workers from the U.S.A. who are working in the Soviet Union have full rights. They are treated as equals by the native workers, who have shown this in many cases by electing Negroes as their representatives to the Soviets.

If the Russians can do all this why can't we American workers do the same thing? The Communist Party believes that we can, but it is not going to be an easy job. A handful of people cannot make a revolution. The Communist Party will never lead the workers in an attempt to seize power in America until the majority of the working class and poor farmers believe firmly that a revolution is the only solution for their problems, and are ready to fight to the end for victory. And who has a better right to demand and carry through a revolutionary change than the majority of the poor people of the country? Therefore the big task of the Communists today is to *convince* the workers that their present misery and poverty, brought on by the capitalist greed for profits, can only be permanently overcome by ending the rule of Wall Street bankers and the big bosses, and setting up in its place the rule of the working class.

CAPITALISTS WILL FIGHT TO BITTER END

But even after a majority of the city and country poor *are* convinced that a revolutionary change is necessary, and even though the majority of the middle class (small businessmen, lawyers, doctors, engineers, etc.) agree with the working class, will the capitalist class surrender their power without a struggle? We hardly think so.

Our country is supposed to have a democratic form of government, where the majority rules. But somehow the handful of the very rich, the bosses and bankers, have always managed to have their way against the majority. They own and control the newspapers and radio-broadcasting stations, they dominate the schools and the churches. They are thus enabled to miseducate, misinform and mislead large sections of the population. They have powerful lobbies in Washington and in every state capitol to exert their corrupt influence on Congress and the state legislatures. If need be, they can resort to, and many a time they have resorted to, intimidation, bribery, vote-stealing and ballot-box stuffing.

They have done these things even in cases when it was only a question of giving up a tiny mite of their wealth, squeezed out of the laboring majority of the population. The capitalists today insist on forcing lower wages and worse conditions on the workers. As every worker knows they always stubbornly resist every demand of the workers for slightly higher wages, or shorter hours, or an easing of the unbearable stretch-out. Surely when the whole profit system of exploitation and robbery will be threatened,

when it will come to the question of who shall rule the country, this handful of greedy and unscrupulous men can be counted on to resort to every means to fight the majority and to insist on retaining power in their own hands at all costs.

THE GOVERNMENT IS CONTROLLED BY THE CAPITALISTS

Above all, it must be remembered, they will have behind them the government itself. Every worker who has been through a strike knows only too well that the local police forces are always controlled by the bosses and always act against the strikers. The textile strikers know that the state governments, which sent the National Guard to shoot them down, are also under the thumb of the capitalist class. The same thing is true of the federal government at Washington. As we have shown, the N.R.A. codes were drawn up to suit the bosses and not the workers. As we saw in the textile strike, President Roosevelt, in spite of all his promises, was ready to send in the regular Army to break the strike—and it would not be the first time the Army has been used to murder strikers and break strikes. This year the country is controlled by the Democratic Party, led by Roosevelt. A few years ago it was ruled by the Republicans, but strikes were broken, strikers murdered and Negroes lynched in the same brutal manner that the Democrats employ today. Both parties are the loyal servants of the capitalists. Besides these the capitalist class will count on its hired thugs and murderers, organized in the K.K.K., the White Legion, etc., to fight their battles.

Then, if the capitalist class continues to resist the will of the majority of the poor people—and this means the overwhelming majority of the population—the working class will have to use other means and defend themselves and their interests with force, if necessary, against the capitalists. Only when the workers are prepared to go to any lengths to satisfy the burning demands of the majority of the city and country poor, will a successful revolution be possible.

FOR A SOVIET AMERICA

This, then, is the final goal of Communist activity—a working class revolution and the establishment of Soviet Power (that is, the power of the organized working class in alliance with the poor farmers and the Negro people) in America. It is not an easy road, but there is no other that will lead to the final solution of the problems facing the workers and poor farmers today. Every strike, every struggle of the unemployed for more relief, every struggle of the sharecroppers for the right to sell their crops themselves, is a step forward along this road to freedom. In the course of these struggles we will learn how to fight, we will test our leaders in the heat of the battle and we will hasten the day when we, the workers of America, will win our country for our class.

FOR A UNITED WORKING CLASS

Most important of all, in the course of the struggles for our day-to-day demands we must and will succeed in achieving for the first time in our country a truly *united*

working class. As long as our class is split into warring groups, with the white arrayed against the Negro, Methodist against Catholic, Democrat or Republican against Communist, just so long will the capitalist class be able to slash our wages and starve us in the soup lines, without serious or successful resistance by us. The situation in the South today and the whole experience of the class struggle proves this inescapable fact beyond all doubt.

Not every worker may, as yet, agree with the Communists that a revolutionary change, which will put the workers in power, is both necessary and unavoidable in this country, but every honest worker, who has his own interests and the interests of the working class at heart, must agree that *it is both possible and vitally necessary for all workers to unite on a common program of struggle against wage-cuts and for higher wages, for unemployment insurance, for the right to freely organize and strike, for full equality for the Negro people. The Communist Party calls on the workers and poor farmers of the South, without distinction, to join hands with us, in common struggle for these immediate demands.*

To those Negro and white workers and poor farmers who agree fully with the Communist program: *The Communist Party declares that it is both your duty and your right to join now, today, the Communist Party of the United States, and fight shoulder to shoulder with the tens of thousands of your revolutionary American fellow workers for a Soviet America.*

Read More About Communism and What It Fights For

Why Communism?	
Plain Talks on Vital Problems—by M. J. Olgin	.05
The Communist Manifesto	
by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels	.05
The Communist Position in the Farmers' Movement	.05
The Communist Position on the Negro Question	.10
Negro Liberation	
by James S. Allen	.05
Why Hearst Lies About Communism	
by William F. Dunne	.05
Communists in the Textile Strike	
by C. A. Hathaway	.02
The Government Takes a Hand in the Cotton Patch	
by George Anstrom	.02
Farm Dollar Blight	
The New Deal in Agriculture — by John Barnett	.02
What War Means to the Workers	
by Robert F. Dunn	.02
Mother Bloor	
by Ann Barton	.03
The Soviet Union—Your Questions Answered	
by Margaret Cowl	.03

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

2, O. BOX 148, STA. D

NEW YORK CITY